

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 434

CS 211 988

AUTHOR Rose, Shirley
TITLE Citation Rituals in Academic Cultures.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (40th, Seattle, WA, March 16-18, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citations (References); Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Research Skills; Scholarship; *Writing for Publication; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Discourse Communities; Organizational Culture; Ritual Behavior; *Scholarly Writing

ABSTRACT

Citation practice in scholarly writing is the enactment of a set of beliefs shared by the academic community, and it is these rituals which enact and thereby confirm adherence to certain values. The citation practices of a whole discourse community can be viewed as a representative anecdote of collaborative effort to establish the collective knowledge of that community. Students' failure to observe citation rituals will prohibit their acceptance into the scholarly community. Writing teachers should consider designing exercises and assignments which require students to attend consciously to citation practice in the writing they read. Students may become interested in citation practice once they realize that it is a chance to exercise the power to participate in shaping the knowledge and belief of their community. (Thirty-five references are attached.) (RS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED309434

CS211588

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley Rose

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- ☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC):

Shirley Rose
San Diego State University
CCCC 1989

Citation Rituals in Academic Cultures

A year ago at this conference, I discussed the individual scholarly writer's citation practice in Burkean terms of identification and division. I considered citation at the microcosmic level as a representative anecdote of a scholar's attempts to identify with certain writers and divide herself from others. Thus I focused on citation as courtship of or collaboration with other writers and readers.

My focus today is on citation practice at the macrocosmic level, viewing the citation practices of a whole discourse community as a representative anecdote of collaborative effort to establish the collective knowledge of that community.

Only a Derridean can effectively--however neatly or messily--dismiss citation rituals altogether by discoursing on the iterability or un-iterability of discourse, as Derrida does in his exchange with John Searle carried on in the pages of Glyph 1 and Glyph 2 on the subject of John Austin's speech act theory.

The rest of us are as constrained by the academic culture's rituals of citation as E.D. Hirsch, Jr. has proven to be in the seemingly endless response/counter-response/counter-counter-response sequence initiated by Hirsch's publication of Cultural Literacy and carried on by Hirsch, James Sledd and Andrew Sledd, and Robert Scholes in College English, the MLA's Profession '88, and the MLA Newsletter. Like Hirsch, we are expected to represent another writer's work accurately.

So, in an effort to better understand the basis of these expectations, I want to look at scholarly citation practice from the religious perspective. If my earlier work considered citation as an act of love, today I am considering it as an act of faith.

Clifford Geertz describes the religious perspective as moving "beyond the realities of everyday life to wider ones which correct and complete them, and its defining concern is not action upon these wider realities, but acceptance of them, faith in them . . ." (112). For Geertz, religious beliefs "do not merely interpret social and psychological processes in cosmic terms--in which case they would be philosophical, not religious--but they shape them." I suggest then that we consider citation practice in scholarly writing to be the enactment of a set of beliefs shared by the academic community. That is, members of the academic community participate in citation rituals in order to enact and thereby confirm their adherence to certain values.

What are the values confirmed by ritual enactment each time a scholarly writer cites another scholarly writer? We might hope to find answers in the documents which describe or prescribe how the citation rituals are to be carried out--but the style manuals are not very helpful as far as explaining why scholars cite other scholars in the way they do or even why they do so at all. Beyond a few introductory remarks about the need to acknowledge

intellectual debts by "giving credit" to sources and the need to provide readers with leads to relevant materials, the manuals offer few clues for interpreting the ritual practices of citation.

A close reading of the Chicago Manual of Style, for example, suggests that the stylistic rules for punctuation, abbreviation, and placement of documentation information are governed by the need for clarity, economy, and the "reader's ease"--pretty much in that order. These controlling values are embedded in explanations of variant rules, such as how to punctuate a quotation from a source, and are usually cast in the form of "should" and "must" statements about the responsibilities of the citing author.

Here are a few examples:

15.40 Whenever possible, a note number should come at the end of a sentence, or at least at the end of a clause. Numbers set between subject and verb or between other related words in a sentence are distracting to the reader.

15.4 The system of documentation generally most economical in space, in time (for author, editor, and typesetter), and in cost (to publisher and public)--in short, the most practical--is the author-date system. Authors' names and dates of publication are given in the text, usually in parenthesis, and keyed to a list of works cited, which is placed at the end of the book or article.

The MLA Style Manual doesn't provide even these embedded explanations, because it presents style rules in the form of "is" and "are" statements.

While the style manuals prescribe, much of the research in citation studies describes. Much of this work on citation practices has been done in the disciplines of library science and social studies of science. When computerized citation indexing became possible, scholars in these disciplines used citation counts to inform document retrieval and evaluate the contributions of individual scholars.

Some of this research is quite interesting. Here is a sample of its findings: researchers in communications disciplines cite social science scholarship more often than researchers in social science disciplines use communication scholarship (Kreps); books are cited most often in monographic literature in the humanities, while manuscripts and journal articles are cited about equally (Cullvers); in works listed under American Literature in the MLA Bibliography for 1981, there were more citations of books than of journal articles (Budd); in economics, women scholars tend to cite more women while men tend to cite more men, thus women are at a disadvantage because they will be cited less often (Ferber).

Other scholars have used citation index data bases to compile information and attempt to identify core journals in a field and relationships between those journals by counting the number of citations made (Summers). Similar studies have even

counted the number of citations a particular author's work receives in order to identify major contributors to particular disciplines or even to predict future Nobel prize winners (Griffith). While the usefulness of the information and the wisdom of the conclusions drawn in many of these studies has been questioned (Cronin), they do reflect assumptions about the role of citations in scholarly writing.

Recently, the interests of citation scholars have turned to identifying citer motivations and analyzing citation contexts. Much of this work, as John Swales has suggested, will interest writing teachers--especially those who teach the research paper in writing across the curriculum programs--for several models of citer motivations have been developed which distinguish between types of citations and their relative frequency in different disciplines. But, as Henry Small has observed, these citer motivation models fail to provide a theoretical framework for fully explaining citation practices--the motives of the citing writers, the way readers respond to the kind, number, and style of citation, or readers' expectations about whom should be cited for which work in reference to what subject.

Some citation scholars, Gilbert for example, have considered the practice of scholarly citation as persuasion, describing the scholar's practice as an effort to present the best argument or case to his/her reader and the citation as persuasive tool. Indeed, as Louis Gottschalk has pointed out, the several denotations of the term "citation" suggest the nature of the footnote as a summons to a witness in a court of law.

Thus far, I've been developing the point that citation is a collaborative ritual faithfully, strictly adhered to, but not fully understood. In what follows, I will argue that citation can be better understood as a ritual of collaboration.

RITUAL OF COLLABORATION

Henry Small has suggested that scholars cite works which are symbolic of ideas and concepts they are discussing. Citation of these works is a shorthand way of including large sets of information and complex ideas previously discussed in the body of the new work. Small views citations as symbol usage; cited documents serve as symbols for concepts or ideas the citing author wishes to express or discuss. Frequently cited documents in the literature of a discipline are "standard symbols" of an idea or concept for the whole community. Within a single citing document, a cited document may serve as a "private" symbol of an idea or concept for the citing author.

Conceiving "the social determination" of scientific knowledge "as a dialogue among citing authors on the "meaning" of earlier texts, Small considers the importance of citation practices to the creation of scientific community and notes that the "cognitive function" (citations as symbols of concepts or ideas) "arises from the formal requirement imposed on the scientist author of embedding his references to earlier literature in a written text. This leads to citing of works

which embody ideas the author is discussing" (328).

Building upon Small's ideas, then, we might look at the ways in which citing authors participate in a discipline's collective process of creating knowledge. One of the most important elements of this process appears to be identification/division-- identification of what counts as shared knowledge and division from what has been refuted or rejected as knowledge. Identification/Division takes place in the ritual practices of citation in scholarly writing. Every time a scholar presents a review of the literature in her area of inquiry, or writes a bibliographical essay, or incorporates another writer's words or ideas to advance her own thesis, she maps the field of her discipline. She draws the boundaries, circumscribes the territory of her field of discourse, and determines who else is within and who is without.

This makes citation practices critical to a scholarly discipline. And though we may not share much explicit, formal knowledge of it, it is very important to us. For example, consider some anecdotal evidence I've collected recently:

In a bibliography circulated at a preconvention workshop here at this year's CCCC, titled "Feminist Studies/Composition Studies Bibliography," Lisa Albrecht characterizes two works as "overquoted"; of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's Women's Ways of Knowing, Albrecht writes "over-rated and overquoted." Carol Gilligan's In a Different Voice "gets cited too much." This is an excellent illustration of my point. In this brief, only minimally annotated bibliography, Albrecht has mapped the territory and drawn the lines that identify work related to "intersections of race/class/gender" from a feminist perspective and divided it from other work in areas that might otherwise be considered related. The two notes I've pointed out are especially interesting because they call attention to citation practice explicitly.

How could a work be "cited too much," "overquoted"? What are the consequences of this inappropriate citation practice? Albrecht is suggesting that these two works do not merit the stature they receive as a result of being frequently and repeatedly cited. With so very few words, Albrecht has exercised great power. I know I'll think twice before I cite Gilligan's work again or mention Belenky et. al, however important I might consider them to be in terms of their introductions of new research methodologies. I know that out there somewhere is at least one person who may dismiss my work not because I've failed to include a reference but because I have included it. It is not enough to demonstrate familiarity with relevant related work; it is not enough to acknowledge other related literature; it is not enough to accurately represent that work with stylistic clarity and grace. One must also know when not to know, when not to acknowledge another's work.

My second illustrative anecdote also comes from this convention: Thursday morning, Sue Carter Simmons presented a paper titled "Men with Teeth: Male Historians of 19th Century

American Rhetoric" in which she quoted six or seven male historians' narratives of 19th century rhetoric. Simmons' focus was on these historians' use of war metaphors to narrate their versions of rhetorical history. When she read these quotations, she did so without attributing them to their respective authors because she did not want to "point a finger." Of course she didn't need to attribute them--many of us in the audience knew whom she was quoting anyway, but I want to call your attention to Simmons' desire to avoid proscribing these writers by giving them a negational citation--it's the thought that counts here. By quoting, but not attributing words, Simmons attempted to criticize these writers without banishing them from the community she defines and embraces in writing the paper. It is probably not irrelevant that this strategy is used in a feminist critique.

Stephen North's critique of Stephen Witte's essay "Topical Structure and Revision: An Exploratory Study" further illustrates my point that citation is a ritual of collaboration wherein a writer attempts to create community by affirming or denying community membership and by defining shared beliefs. North chose Witte's essay as an exemplar of the way "knowledge is made in the field of composition." Noting--parenthetically--that Witte's essay is "almost certainly the most heavily documented article in the history of [CCC]" North analyzes the way Witte presented or misrepresented the works he cited in his opening paragraphs in order to "establish the context within which he wants his exploratory study to acquire its meaning" (339).

There is no need to go into detail on this--I want merely to call your attention to the significance North assigns to Witte's citation practice:

Witte is not obliged to offer a comprehensive review of the literature or revision, nor, despite the heavy documentation, does he pretend to. I suppose it is even possible to argue that the whole passage could be deemed strictly ceremonial, and that he includes these titles simply by way of ritual salutation . . . But the seriousness of his tone, the careful documentation, and the essay's reception indicate otherwise. They may be, as his qualifiers suggest, exemplars and representatives, but they are deliberately and carefully chosen. (340-341)

As North's critique of Witte's essay illustrates, each act of citation both identifies new work with some old work and divides the new work from other old work, it draws boundaries. The text defines the space which will become its context: a writer like Witte creates a community in which he may participate. Another writer, North, passes judgment on that created community, on its resemblance to his own community and its rituals. Readers of North, in turn, pass judgment on North's faithfulness. Thus, collaboratively, through their collective citation practices, members of a scholarly discourse community define true faith.

Citation rituals help construct the social reality of

academic culture in general and specific disciplines or areas of inquiry in particular--and so is an essentially collaborative action. Thus, aberrant or unconventional citation practices, new and different rituals, may be understood as attempts to establish separation from the community, attempts to disrupt the community by attacking the rituals that enact the community's values, or attempts to change those values. That's why editors and reviewers take such pains--or why we think they should take such pains--about the citation practice of essays or books submitted to consideration for publication. If these texts are to deserve the community status with which publication officially endorses them, they must observe the community's rituals.

I turn now to an examination of some examples of unconventional citation practices which have somehow gotten past the citation police. I want to focus on two works in particular: Luce Irigary's "On the Index to Plato's Works: Women," which is part of her book, Speculum, and Rachel Blau Du Plessis' essay "For the Etruscans."

"On the Index to Plato's Works: Women" is a string of quotations from Plato's writings mentioning women. Irigary has not contributed one single word to this twenty-or-so page section of her book. But, of course, her presence is palpable as one reads through these snippets from Plato. After having read Irigary's thorough going word for word commentary, critique, and deconstruction of passages from Freud's writing in the preceding section of her book, one can write Irigary's response to Plato oneself--and one does. As I read this section, I have the strange sensation of hearing myself talk back to Plato in the same fashion as Irigary had talked back to Freud. Indeed, Irigary does go on to "talk back" to Plato in the book section which follows, "Plato's Hystera," in which she paraphrases Plato's description of the cave and gives an elaborate, sentence by sentence explication.

But my focus is Irigary's unconventional citation practice in "On the Index of Plato's Works: Women." This is extensive quoting without commentary to an extreme--the conventional scholar would have embedded the quotations from Plato in commentary of her own--that's what the style manuals and the handbooks teach us. That Irigary has chosen not to enact this citation ritual is emblematic of her rejection of scholarly discourse conventions. But this is more than rejection; it is subversion.

My second example of unconventional citation practice is Rachel Blau Du Plessis' essay "For the Etruscans," reprinted in Showalter's The New Feminist Criticism. Du Plessis' essay employs the collage design she has used in her poetry. Quotations from other writers are inserted, unintegrated, without commentary in the middle of Du Plessis' own sentences, interrupting her syntax, yet somehow elaborating her meaning; relevant work by four different feminist researchers and theorists is referenced in a one to six sentence summary (it's hard to tell, unless one already knows, where Du Plessis' ideas

end and her summary of others' ideas begins) and documented in an endnote which does not explicitly indicate whose contribution was whose; quotations from other writers are laced with Du Plessis' own parenthetical commentary or gloss--in a sense, her words are given footnote status, much like scholia. Some of these quotations are surrounded by quotation marks, others are not; the governing principle seems to be the degree to which Du Plessis has either assimilated/integrated the content into her own exploration of an idea and thus engaged the cited writer in conversation or provided quoted words without comment, thus choosing, it would seem, to merely listen.

If we hear her essay as talk, the quoted material can be heard as voices interrupting Du Plessis, speaking over her, engaging her in conversation, being listened to (deferred to), or, in the case of borrowed phrases, actually speaking through DuPlessis. In these terms, Du Plessis' citation practice is rule-governed, though the rules are her own. She signals the status of each of these voices by her use of punctuation, boldface, italics, and indentation. Thus, while the essay has the appearance of unpredictable collage or juxtapositional form, it also follows progressive form insofar as it resembles turn taking in spoken discourse.

I think it is significant that these two exemplary writers are feminists attempting to inscribe a feminine discourse. Their unconventional citation practices are not merely alternative ways, but disruptions and subversions of standard practice--or customary ritual--and therefore are re-mappings of the field of discourse insofar as they reform the discourse of the field.

LEARNING THE RITUALS/ ACCEPTING THE FAITH

So, I come to the question of how, why, and whether writing teachers address citation conventions in teaching the research paper, scholarly discourse forms, or any writing that incorporates the writing of others.

The rules of citation--whatever they are, whyever they are, however tacitly they may be acquired--cannot be dismissed. practice cannot be ignored. Failure to observe these ritualizations will prohibit the student from acceptance (however lowly the status) into the scholarly community. If he does not honor the values of the community by observing its rituals he will not be recognized. If he is not recognized, he is silenced. Unheard, he is eventually excluded completely.

What might be appropriate ways to help our students learn these rituals of citation? Instead of handing our students a copy of the MLA Style Manual--or an abbreviated handbook version of it--we might consider designing exercises and assignments which require students to consciously attend to citation practice in the writing they read. We might, for example, encourage them to identify and articulate the rules themselves--as John Swales suggests--by having them analyze scholarly discourse using already developed citer motivation schema or categorizing and classifying types of citations, citer motivations, and reader

responses to citation on their own.

In this way, they may see that writers' citation practices bear witness to their integration into the scholarly community and into their specific disciplines. Not every student will fully appreciate the privilege and opportunity to enter the scholarly community presented by the research paper assignment. Some will not be all that keen on attempting to place their discourse in a larger field. They may, however, be interested if we suggest it is a chance to exercise power--power to participate in shaping what is knowledge and belief--just one of the powers of writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtert, Walter S. and Joseph Gibaldi. The MLA Style Manual. New York: Modern Language Association, 1985.
- Brooks, Terrence A. "Citer Motivations." Encyclopedia of Library Information Science 1988 Supplement. pp 48-59.
- Belenky, Mary Field, et al. Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
- Burke, Kenneth. Counterstatement. Berkeley: U California P, 1968.
- . A Rhetoric of Motives. 1959 Berkeley: U of California Press, 1969.
- Budd, John. "Characteristics of a Written Scholarship in American Literature: A Citation Study." Library and Information Science Research 8.2 (1986): 189-211.
- The Chicago Manual of Style. 13th ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.
- Cronin, Blaise. The Citation Process: The Role and Significance of Citations in Scientific Communication. London: Taylor Graham, 1984.
- Cullars, John. "Characteristics of the Monographic Literature of British and American Literary Studies." College and Research Libraries 46.6 (1985): 511-522.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Limited Inc abc . . ." Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies 2. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977: 162-254.
- . "Signature Event Context." Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 172-198.
- Du Plessis, Rachel Blau. "For the Etruscans." In The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory. Ed. Elaine Showalter. NY: Pantheon, 271-91.
- Ferber, Marianne A. "Citations: Are They an Objective Measure of Scholarly Merit?" Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 11.2 (1986): 381-389.
- Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Gilbert, G.N. "Referencing as Persuasion." Social Studies of Science 7.1 (Feb. 1972): 113-22.
- Gilligan, Carol. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 1982.
- Gottschalk, Louis. Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method. New York: Knopf, 1950.
- Griffith, B. C., et al. "On the Use of Citation in Studying Scientific Achievement and Communication." Society for the Social Studies of Science Newsletter 2 (1977): 9-13.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. "Comments on Profession '88". Profession (1988): 77-80.
- . Cultural Literacy. Boston: Houghton, 1987.
- . Letter replying to Scholes' reply to "Comments." MLA Newsletter 21.1 (Spring 1989): 26-28.
- Irigary, Luce. Speculum of the Other Woman. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

- Kreps, Gary L. "Analysis of the Interdisciplinary Credibility of Communication as a Social Science." Association of Communication Administration Bulletin 42 (Oct 1982): 40-43.
- North, Stephen M. The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field. Portsmouth: Boynton, 1987.
- Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: APA, 1984.
- Scholes, Robert. "Three Views of Education: Nostalgia, History, and Voodoo." Review of The Closing of the American Mind by Allan Bloom, Professing Literature: An Institutional History by Gerald Graff, and Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know by E. D. Hirsch, Jr. College English 50 (1988): 323-32.
- . Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s "Comment." Profession (1988): 81-82.
- . Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s letter in Spring '89 Newsletter. MLA Newsletter 21.2 (Summer 1989): 21-22.
- Searle, John. R. "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida." Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 199-208.
- Sledd, Andrew and James Sledd. "Hirsch's Use of His Sources in Cultural Literacy: A Critique." Profession (1988): 33-39.
- . Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s "Comments." Profession (1988): 80-81.
- Sledd, James. Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s letter in Spring '89 Newsletter. MLA Newsletter 21.2 (Summer 1989): 22.
- Small, Henry G. "Cited Documents as Concept Symbols." Social Studies of Science 8 (1978): 327-40.
- Summers, Edward G. "A Review and Application of Citation Analysis Methodology to Reading Research Journal Literature." Journal of the American Society for Information Science. 35.6 (1984): 332-343.
- Swales, John. "Utilizing the Literatures in Teaching the Research Paper." TESOL Quarterly 21.1 (March 1987): 41-68.

Citation is also, though Small does not develop this argument at any length, a way of placing the new work into the context of previous work.

15.44 If a note is added, or deleted, in the typescript, the following numbers throughout the chapter must be changed and any cross-references to notes adjusted. Such evidence of negligence as a note numbered 4a is unprofessional . . .